

## **Appendix 4**

### **Recommendations for improvement from verification of partnership governance Health Checks**

#### **All partnerships**

- Whilst many of the Terms of Reference were comprehensive and recent, we would recommend each partnership considers including on the document a 'revision date', as is often included on policies, to prompt a timely review.

#### **One Nottingham**

- One Nottingham confirmed that they are drafting a complaints procedure, which we hope to see finalised soon. In their Health Check return the partnership confirms the intended process for dealing with complaints and disputes, which we feel is comprehensive. We recommend this procedure is formalised and included in the terms of reference as soon as possible.
- One Nottingham confirms in their Health Check that the Corporate Policy Team is responsible for monitoring the Nottingham Plan performance and providing information for an annual report. The Health Check also confirms that action is taken to improve performance if needed, but does not elaborate on who is responsible for either highlighting missed targets or undertaking remedial action. Whatever the process we would recommend this is clarified in documentation, for example Terms of Reference or a Ways of Working paper.
- The Health Check confirms a Funding Sub Group of ON Board members has been established, but this is not included in the Terms of Reference or other formal documentation. We would recommend, especially given the concerns about diminishing funding, that this group's remit, membership and targets are formally recorded, for example in an updated Terms of Reference document or similar.
- One Nottingham did not share with us a formal risk register or risk assessment. If one does not exist, we recommend one is developed to include consideration of the risk to the partnership's existence and to the Nottingham Plan targets if sufficient future funding is not secured.

#### **Health and Wellbeing Board**

- The role of the Executive Steering Group is included in the Board's Ways of Working document, however it was not completely clear what powers they have over the Board and what impact they have on the Board's decisions. We recommend this process is more explicitly laid out in the Ways of Working document.
- The Health Check return confirmed that the Executive Steering Group "helps to identify and manage risks associated with effective operation of the Board". It was not clear whether this is minuted or how these risks and any mitigations are recorded. We would recommend the process for formal noting of risks and the mitigations/feedback which comes from the Executive Steering Group is confirmed, perhaps by including in the Ways of Working document.
- The Health and Wellbeing Board Commissioning Sub-Committee's (HWBCSC) report template is comprehensive and thorough, and includes questions on identifying risks and equalities. These enquiries are not included on the Health and Wellbeing Board's report template. Whilst we understand that the HWBCSC makes financial decisions and so more information about budget and associated matters is required on their reports, we would recommend questions on identifying risks and equalities could be included on the Health and Wellbeing Board's report template as well.

- For both 'Equalities' and 'Finance' the Board scored itself as 2. Based on the documentation we saw we would suggest these scores are at least approaching 1, if not already achieving that level.

### **Nottingham City Safeguarding Adults Board**

- We were provided with information in the form of a link to the relevant website page for any documents in the public domain, which was up-to-date. On searching the Council's intranet pages for 'Safeguarding Adults' however, there was out-of-date information and the page had not been updated since 2016. We would recommend the partnership ensures their intranet pages are also up-to-date or, if the documents will be the same, it links to their outward-facing website to ensure colleagues do not access old information. A link to their Board's website could also save time in uploading and maintaining two sites.
- On the Board's website there is an 'Annual Business Plan' for 2017-18. The document includes a RAG rating key at the beginning, but there are no RAG ratings in the document itself as the plan is current. We would recommend that underneath the key, it is made clear that this has not yet been applied to the document as it is still being implemented and that the key is there to show how the document will be reviewed when this takes place.
- Under 'Decision Making and Accountability', the Board scored itself as 2; given the documentation we have seen we would suggest a score of 1 would be acceptable.
- Under 'Equalities' the Board responded that business is managed "in accordance with the individual partner policies". If this is not already in place, we would recommend this is confirmed in one of the governance documents, and that an occasional review of partner policies is undertaken to ensure they comply with the Council's own.
- We were informed that there was no written record of the partnership's budget, but that it is overseen by the Board's Business Management Group. As the budget is amalgamated from contributions from three key partners, we would recommend formal recording of the budget is kept somewhere, whether in notes from a meeting or a separate document.

### **Green Nottingham Partnership (being re-verified)**

- We received an updated Terms of Reference from the one we had last year and it is much improved on the previous version. In the minutes of the partnership's meeting for April 2017 it was confirmed that revisions to the Terms of Reference would be made to the Terms of Reference as follows:
  - NCH to be added to the list of membership. Nottingham Primary Care Trust/ NHS has changed to CCG; HR to confirm and email JL. Nottingham Development Enterprise is no longer functioning so can be removed from the membership list.

These amendments have not yet taken place, and as there was no 'due by' date for the action, we recommend a revision date is made for the Terms of Reference to ensure the above action is not lost. Additionally, the Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership is included on the Terms of Reference as a member, however we understand the partnership has ceased to exist.
- The Green Nottingham Partnership confirmed they were working to ensure improved attendance from business. We recommend consideration is given to naming substitutes who can attend in place of regular board members.
- There was no consideration given to membership changes, dispute resolution and exit strategies. We recommend the Green Partnership look to including these in their next Terms of Reference.

- The Green Nottingham Partnership scored themselves 2 for Membership and Structure, we would accept this score on the understanding that the recommendations above are taken into consideration.
- An action log was referenced in the Terms of Reference but we did not see a copy so we are unable to comment on this.
- We were unable to find the Green Nottingham Partnership pages on the intranet, which we were informed house minutes of board meetings. There are also some documents available for the partnership via One Nottingham's website, however these are out of date (the Terms of Reference is from 2012). We would recommend the Green Nottingham Partnership establishes its intranet/internet presence and ensures documents available online are kept up to date.
- The partnership scored themselves 1 for 'Performance Management', and the comments given as further explanation referred back to the explanation given for the first question, relating to 'Aims and Objectives'. As the Green Nottingham Partnership scored themselves 2 for 'Aims and Objectives' we would recommend a score of 2 for 'Performance Management' as well.
- For 'Evaluation and Review' the partnership scored themselves 1, and referred again to the 'Aims and Objectives' section, adding this is underway. As the work is underway we feel we cannot accept a score of 1 although we acknowledge much progress has been made, therefore we recommend 'Evaluation and Review' is also scored as a 2.
- For 'Equalities', again the work is ongoing so we recommend a score of 2 would be more appropriate than the score of 1 which the partnership has given themselves.
- The partnership did not answer the question about 'Partnership Risk Management' or give themselves a score. We recommend risk assessment takes place alongside the development of the Sustainable Development Action Plan. Even if there is no financial risk there may be a reputational risk to the Council if targets, including those in the Council Plan or Nottingham Plan, are not met.
- The Green Nottingham Partnership did not enter a score for Finance, which was accepted as the partnership receives no funding.
- The partnership did not enter a score for Partnership Risk Management, we would recommend a score is considered next time.
- As the partnership has shown vast improvements to its partnership governance arrangements, and is working on the Sustainable Development Action Plan (SDAP) with limited capacity, we recommend the partnership is not re-verified until 2019. This will allow the partnership time to embed any further improvements once the SDAP is in place.